

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11-14, 16 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,047, and Savitzky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

A receipt, by definition and placed into context of Applicants' claims, is an instrument acknowledging the receiving of goods (pages of the document). A quota, or a quota limit, in the context of Bauer, is a maximum allowed amount of a resource available to a user. Under no reasonable interpretation of the words receipt and quota is a quota, or a quota limit, equivalent to a receipt. A quota does not serve the same function as a receipt and is not a substitute for a receipt.

The wording of Applicants' claims makes it clear that the receipt is an instrument for tracking whether particular pages have been received, i.e. printed. The quota system disclosed in Bauer does not track whether a particular document has been received, but instead is a means for tracking the total amount of a resource consumed by a user. In Bauer, when pages are printed, the number of pages is added to the total until the quota limit is reached. No instrument is disclosed in Bauer that serves the purpose of a receipt, i.e. to acknowledge the receiving (printing) of goods (pages of a document). That is, nothing acknowledges that a particular page has been printed. Since the quotas disclosed in Bauer cannot, by definition and usage, be a receipt and Bauer does not disclose any other instrument acting as a receipt, Bauer does not disclose a receipt.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Bauer does not teach copying the original receipt to the print job agent or updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the document was printed. Instead, the Examiner indicates that Savitsky discloses this wording. By citing col. 10, lines 36-44, the Examiner appears to be suggesting that the transaction disclosed by Savitsky is equivalent to Applicants' receipt.

Savitsky discloses proxy agent 36 of agency 32 handling a document request either by requesting the document or generating a transaction, which causes the document to be retrieved. However, the transaction of Savitsky is not copied from a previous location, and neither is it updated. Therefore, the transaction of Savitsky does not respond to the limitations of the receipt in Applicants claims, which require copying the original receipt to the print job agent and updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the document was printed.

Therefore, neither Bauer nor Savitsky discloses the wording of Applicants' claims related to the receipt as disclosed by the Examiner. Namely, Bauer does not even disclose a receipt for a document and Savitsky does not disclose copying the original receipt to the print job agent and updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one page of the document was printed.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, and 17 include the wording "copying the original receipt to the print job agent" and "updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the at least one page of the document was printed." Neither Savitsky nor Bauer disclose these steps and neither do they disclose these steps when viewed together.

The Examiner has objected to claims 7 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims 1 and 9 respectively, but would allow claims 7 and 15 if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 3).

Applicants acknowledge potential allowable status of claims 7 and 15 and elect not to so rewrite them at this time.

In view of Applicants' arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson and  
James E. Clough

By   
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 09/13/2004  
(719) 260-7900